

REMARKS

In the Non-Final Office Action, Examiner Ho rejected pending claims 6 and 7 on various grounds. The Applicant responds to each rejection as subsequently recited herein, and respectfully requests reconsideration and further examination of the present application under 37 CFR § 1.112:

- A. Examiner Ho rejected independent claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The Applicant has thoroughly considered Examiner Ho's remarks concerning the subject matter of independent claim 7. To warrant this non-statutory subject matter rejection of independent claim 7, the signal claim must not be directed to a practical application of the signal claim. See, MPEP §2106(IV)(B)(1)(c). The Applicant respectfully traverses this non-statutory subject matter rejection of independent claim 7, because the recitation "which receives at regular time intervals a synchronization pattern which is selected such that it differs by a prescribable Hamming distance from all the valid data signals of the time slot coding independently of the respective time slot of the data signals, and that it differs by a prescribable Hamming distance from all time-shifted versions of the synchronization pattern" is directed to a practical application of the time-slot-coded signal in receiving the synchronization pattern as recited.

Withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter therefore respectfully requested.

- B. Examiner Ho rejected independent claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,086,537 to *Asakawa*

The Applicant has thoroughly considered Examiner Ho's remarks concerning the patentability of independent claim 6 over *Asakawa*. The Applicant has also thoroughly read *Asakawa*. To warrant this anticipation rejection of independent claim 6, *Asakawa* must show

each and every limitation of independent claim 6 in as complete detail as in contained in independent claim 6. See, MPEP §2131. The Applicant respectfully traverses this anticipation rejection of independent claim 6, because *Asakawa* fails to show “wherein the synchronization detector is provided for generating a synchronization pulse when a Hamming distance between the data stream and the synchronization pattern undershoots a prescribable threshold value” in as complete detail as in contained in independent claim 6.

Withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Asakawa* is therefore respectfully requested.

SUMMARY

Examiner Ho's rejection of claim 7 has been obviated by the remarks herein supporting the statutory subject matter of claim 7. Examiner Ho's rejection of claim 6 has been obviated by remarks herein supporting an allowance of claim 6 over *Asakawa*. The Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-9, particularly claims 6 and 7, fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§ 102, 103 and 112. In view of the foregoing, favorable consideration and early passage to issue of the present application is respectfully requested. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, Examiner Ho is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Dated: **August 17, 2006**

Respectfully submitted,
MANFRED ZINKE

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
& STANDARDS
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, New York 10510

Paul Im
Registration No. 50,418
Attorney for Applicant

CARDINAL LAW GROUP
Suite 2000
1603 Orrington Avenue
Evanston, Illinois 60201
Phone: (847) 905-7111
Fax: (847) 905-7113

/FRANK C. NICHOLAS
Frank C. Nicholas
Registration No. 33,983
Attorney for Applicant